Index to Minutes of Meeting
The Commission of Fine Arts
19 November 1956

Auditorium, District of Columbia
Possible sites for 9

Bridge/Tunnel at Constitution Avenue 4

Carillon, The Netherlands
Preliminary meeting with Dutch architect 9

Decoration of Public Buildings
Draft of proposed legislation providing funds for 5
Defense, Department of
Distinguished Public Service Medal 7

Executive Order for Commission of Fine Arts
Status of Request for 5

Harrison, Wallace
Offer of resignation from Commission 1

Inner Loop
Interchange at Second Street on Southwest Highway 8

Legislation - Draft
Proposal to expand the duties and increase membership on the Commission of Fine Arts 5

To provide funds for decoration of public buildings 5

Minutes of previous meetings
changes in 1
Mitchell, General William (Statue)
Design for base and lettering 8

National Association of Life Underwriters
Protest of Conger Laundry on condemnation of property 3
National Collection of Fine Arts
New building for 6

Postage Stamp Design
Interview with Mr. Harry Lindquist 7
Post Office Department
Landscaping driveway in 12th Street Hemicycle 5

Public Law 808-Old Georgetown Act
Disregard of recommendations by Commissioners 4
Report of actions taken since October 10, 1956 3

Report of Commission of Fine Arts, Sixteenth
Printing of 6

Shipstead-Luce Act
Approval of submissions 9
Peoples Life Insurance Company
model of proposed building 8
Report of actions taken since October 10, 1956 3
Stadium, National, site for 7
State, Department of
Sculpture program prepared by Marshall Fredericks 1

Tomb of Unknown Soldier
New crypts for unknowns of World War II and Korea 6

Zoning Report by Harold Lewis 6

Minutes of the Meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts
Held in Washington, D.C., 19 November 1956
9:30 a.m.

The meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts was held in its offices in the Interior Department Building on 19 November 1956, with the following members in attendance:

Mr. David E. Finley, Chrmn.
Mr. Douglas W. Orr, V.Chrmn.
Mr. Felix de Weldon
Mr. Elbert Peets
Mr. Wm. G. Perry

The Chairman read to the members a telegram and letter from Mr. Wallace Harrison regretting that he could not attend the meeting, and offering to resign from the Commission because the pressure of his own work is so great that he finds it difficult to come to Washington for the meetings. After careful discussion, it was the consensus that the Chairman write to Mr. Harrison asking him to remain as a member of the Commission, although he cannot come to all of the meetings, but do do so whenever possible; also that the Secretary will keep him informed of Commission business and will seek his advice by letter. EXHIBITS A and B.

The Chairman also told the members that Mrs. Muir was unable to be present at the meeting because of the death of her father, and it was agreed to send a telegram of sympathy to Mrs. Muir from the members.

Minutes of Previous Meetings.

The Secretary reported that the minutes for the meeting held on 13 and 14 September 1956 had been sent to the members; and that Mrs. Muir had written on October 30th, raising objections to the statement in the minutes stating that "The majority of the members agreed that Mr. Fredericks be authorized to prepare a sculpture program in which the talents of more than one sculptor will be utilized, and that Mr. Fredericks' assistance in preparing the program should not exclude him later from execution of a part of the program, if that is desired.

The Chairman read Mrs. Muir's letter to the members, and there followed a long discussion of the qualifications of Mr. Fredericks to set up the program for the incorporation of sculpture into the new Annex for the Department of State. It was the opinion of Mr. Peets that the program should not be set up by a sculptor but by an architect who had a broad understanding of the arts. Mr. Orr thought that it would be difficult to get the architects to agree to call in another architect to set up the sculptural program; and that it was his understanding that the sculptor, Mr. Fredericks, would prepare a program of what is desired in the way of

sculpture for the architects and they, in turn, would submit it to the Commission of Fine Arts.

The Chairman suggested that he would be glad to discuss this matter with Mr. Hunter, Assistant Commissioner for Design and Construction, Public Buildings Service, if the members so desired, stating that the Commission approved the selection of Mr. Fredericks as the sculptor to set up the program with the understanding that the Commission would have the opportunity of considering the qualifications of any individual sculptors who might be considered for execution for the various parts of the program. Mr. Orr felt the question was also one of concern to the Department of State and that the decision would have to be made jointly by the Commission of Fine Arts and the Department of State.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the following resolution was adopted by those members present, Messrs. Finley, Orr, Perry, de Weldon and Peets:

RESOLVED

That the Commission of Fine Arts approve, and hereby it does approve, the recommendation of Mr. Marshall Fredericks by the Public Buildings Service of the General Services Administration and the architects of the proposed State Department Annex, to set up a program for the decoration of the building with the understanding that the program would be later submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts for approval; also the names of the individual artists who might executive the program.

Mr. Peets then said he would like to suggest a change in the minute dealing with the approval of the statue of General William Mitchell, also contained in the Minutes of the meeting on 13 and 14 of September 1956. Mr. Peets referred to the statement that, "upon motion duly made and seconded the following resolution was adopted, with Mrs. Muir dissenting." Mr. Peets said that he also would have voted "no" on approval of the statue, and would like to suggest that the following sentence be inserted in the Minutes: "The members of the Commission who approved the statue considered it to be a factual image of the subject such as is appropriate to a historical museum." The motion was made and seconded that the Minutes of 13 and 14 September 1956 be approved with the revision as stated by Mr. Peets.

RESOLVED

That the members of the Commission of Fine Arts approve, and hereby they do approve, the minutes of the meeting on 13 and 14 September 1956, with the insertion suggested on the approval of the statue of General William Mitchell.

Date of Next Meeting

The Secretary reported that the minutes of the meeting held on 10 October 1956 were in process of preparation and he hoped to have them ready to send out very soon.

After a discussion of several possible dates for the next meeting, it was agreed that the meeting would be held on 13 December 1956.

Report of action taken on Shipstead-Luce Applications since 10 October Meeting.

The Secretary called attention to Appendix 1 which lists the Shipstead Luce cases that have been acted on during the last month. He stated that 9 had been approved, with one still pending, and one disapproved. This case, SL 1914 involved a show window of the Drug Store at 13th and E streets, N. W. to extend three feet beyond the building line. Copies of the drawings for the proposed show window were circulated to the members and the replies were for disapproval, in accordance with regulations adopted by the Commission and printed with the Shipstead-Luce Act. After careful discussion, it was moved, seconded and carried that the action taken on all cases on Appendix 1 be confirmed. EXHIBIT C.

Report of action taken on Old Georgetown Applications since 10 October meeting.

The Secretary said that Appendix 2 listed 39 cases under the Old Georgetown Act on which action had been taken by the Georgetown Board of Architectural Consultants since the last meeting of the Commission on 10 October 1956. Of the 39 cases considered, 2 were disapproved and 37 approved. After study of the individual items and, upon motion duly made and seconded, it was voted to confirm the actions taken by the Georgetown Board of Consultants on all cases listed in Appendix 2. EXHIBIT D.

National Association of Life Underwriters Building.

The Secretary made a report for the record that the Conger Laundry had protested the condemnation of their property in Square 62 which is wanted by General Services Administration to permit a better placement for the building of the National Association of Life Underwriters in relation to the new State Department Annex. He stated that on November 16, 1956, the lawyers for the Conger Laundry had subpoenaed him to appear at a hearing on 19 November 1956 and to produce documents, including site plans and architectural plans, and any correspondence that had passed between the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Association of Life Underwriters regarding the use of the Conger Laundry property. Because the trial was being held on the day of the Commission meeting, he had sent Mr. Luskey to appear for him and identify the documents. These documents included about six letters, two of which were exchanged with the architect regarding the design of the building. The Commission of Fine Arts was involved because its recommendations dealt with the aesthetic advantage of placing the building on the site recommended. Results of the hearing will be reported when known.

Public Law 808, 81st Congress - Disregard of recommendation of the Board of Architectural Consultants for Georgetown.

The Secretary told the members that the three architects, who serve as a Board of Review on all submissions under the Old Georgetown Act, were chagrinned because of the refusal of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to support them and the Commission of Fine Arts in their disapproval of the design for the Golden Commissary Garage, (O.G.#1562). He stated further that Mr. Macomber felt so strongly about the matter that he wished to appear before the meeting and discuss the problem with the members of the Commission.

In a general discussion about the authority of the Commissioners to disregard the recommendation of the Commission of Fine Arts, it was pointed out that there was no question of the Commissioners' authority to issue a permit for a garage in this location under the zoning law. However, it was agreed, that before taking such action, it seemed reasonable that the Commissioners should advise the Commission of Fine Arts of their intentions before issuing permits for projects which have been disapproved by the Commission for unsuitability of architectural design. It was the consensus that the Chairman should write a letter to the District Commissioners asking for a statement as to why the Commission of Fine Arts was not advised of their intention to disregard its recommendations before the action in this case was taken. EXHIBIT E.

After Mr. Macomber joined the meeting he told the members of the Commission that he desired to submit his resignation as a member of the Georgetown Board of Architectural Consultants. He felt he was giving his time to no good end, as long as the recommendations of the Board were disregarded by the District Commissioners. The members were reluctant to accept the resignation and urged Mr. Macomber to reconsider and remain on the Board. They told him that a letter would be written to the District Commissioners in an attempt to get better cooperation on these matters.

Bridge-Tunnel at Constitution Avenue

The Chairman read a letter which he had drafted to send to the Honorable George A. Garrett, President of the Federal City Council, at Mr. Garrett's request, in which he set forth the views of the Commission of Fine Arts in the matter of a bridge/tunnel across the Potomac River at Constitution Avenue. Upon motion duly made, seconded, and carried the draft of the letter to Mr. Garrett was approved. EXHIBIT F, F-1 to 6.

The Chairman then reminded the members that legislation for the bridge/tunnel crossing of the Potomac River in the vicinity of the Constitution Avenue would be introduced again in the Congress when it convenes in January. He reviewed pertinent data which had been furnished for information by the National Capital Parks with a view to establishing the position which the Commission would take in the event an opportunity was given to appear before Committee Hearings on the new legislation. After lengthy discussion, it was agreed that in order to

formulate a firm policy it would be essential for the members to see plans complete enough to show the alternate schemes for the bridge and the tunnel, with all approaches and interchanges. The Secretary was requested to obtain such designs from the National Capital Parks and have them available for study at the next meeting of the Commission on 13 December 1956.

Request for new Executive Order - Status.

The Secretary reported that he had been advised by Mr. Allen Dean, of the Bureau of the Budget, that the draft of the proposed Executive Order for the Commission of Fine Arts had the approval of the Bureau's legal department, and that it also had to be sent to the other departments and agencies of the Government for review. The opinion was expressed by the members that such an Executive Order, if issued by the President would strengthen the relations of the Commission of Fine Arts with other agencies. Fear was expressed the review by others would take considerable time.

Proposed Legislation to Expand the Commission of Fine Arts.

The Chairman called attention to the draft of proposed legislation by Frank Thompson, Jr., Member of Congress, to expand the duties and enlarge the membership of the Commission of Fine Arts. Copies of this proposed legislation had been sent to the members of the Commission and letters stating their views had been received from Mrs. Muir, Mr. Orr and Mr. Perry, while other members had expressed their views verbally. Taking their views into consideration, the Chairman stated he had drafted a letter to Mr. Thompson which he would like to read. This was done and upon motion duly made, seconded and carried, it was voted to approve the letter as written and to forward it to Mr. Thompson. EXHIBIT G.

Proposed Legislation for a Specific Fund for Decoration of Public Buildings.

The Secretary recalled previous discussions regarding a draft of legislation for authority to establish a fund to be used for the decoration of public buildings. The legislation was to be sponsored by the Commission of Fine Arts and, if enacted, administered jointly by the Commission of Fine Arts and the Public Buildings Service of the General Services Administration. The latest draft of the proposed legislation incorporating the ideas of the Commission, was read by the Secretary and upon motion duly made, seconded and carried, it was voted to approve the draft and to request the Secretary to explore the next steps in sponsoring it, with the Bureau of the Budget. EXHIBIT H.

Landscaping Driveway in Twelfth Street Hemicycle, Post Office Department Building.

The Chairman asked Mr. Peets to tell the members of his conference with officials of the Post Office Department and the General Services Administration considering the plan for landscaping the 12th Street hemicycle at the Post Office Department. This planting screened to some extent the driveway recently made there to provide parking for the

Postmaster General. Mr. Peets reported that he was shown an undeveloped plan which did not show the varieties of plants to be planted but just gave the general scheme for planting them. He said he could not be enthusiastic about the plan but made a few suggestions about the type and form of the planting, and thought that it would be satisfactory. The work was planned by the Public Buildings Service and is being executed by National Capital Parks. It was moved, seconded, and carried that Mr. Peets be thanked for the trouble he took in the matter.

Printing the Sixteenth Report of the Commission of Fine Arts.

The Secretary advised the members that the manuscript text of the Sixteenth Report covering the period from July 1948 through June 1954 of the Commission of Fine Arts had been revised in accordance with suggestions made by Mr. Peets. In view of the comparative remoteness of the subject matter, it was suggested that the Report should be prepared for publication more often, perhaps every other year, or even every year. The Chairman pointed out that the that Congress had notdirected the Commission to make a Report but that it had been made consistently over the years since the Commission was established in 1910. It was considered to be an interesting and useful record. There had always been a problem of obtaining fund to print it, and there were no funds available now. The Secretary stated that the manuscript must go, in this case, to the Bureau of the Budget for review, after which the President will submit to Congress, if it is to be printed as a public document. It was moved, seconded and carried that the Secretary proceed with the steps required for printing the Sixteenth Report and to report the progress in doing so.

Smithsonian Institution - National Collection of Fine Arts

The Chairman asked for a discussion on how the Commission of Fine Arts could assist the National Collection of Fine Arts to obtain a new building, or adequate quarters in an existing building. He spoke of the possibility of using the Old Patent Office Building at 8th and F Streets, N W. and mentioned also that there is a very good building adjoining on the Southeast corner, which is going to be demolished, and which was once the Old Post Office. It was agreed that, for the time-being, there was not much that could be done to help but that the Chairman might have more suggestions at the next meeting.

Zoning in the District of Columbia

The Chairman inquired if the members had seen the revised copy of the Zoning Report by Mr. Harold Lewis. The Secretary stated that no copies had yet been received but he thought he could get copies if anyone wanted to see them. Mr. Peets stated that the newspapers gave a very good account of the Report and that he believed Mr. Lewis had conceded a lot in the revised edition.

Department of the Army-New cripts at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

The Chairman reported that there had been public announcement in the newspapers of new crypts for Unknown Soldiers of World War II and the Korean War, to be added to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, and

asked about the Commission's approval of all the plans. The Secretary stated that he believed the amount to be spent on the crypts was $400,000 and that the actual pattern of the materials and location of the crypts had never been finalized. Mr. Peets stated that, in his mind, the Unknown Soldier of World War I was still to be the symbol and there would be no sculpture or architectural construction added.

Site of National Memorial Stadium.

The Secretary reported that the National Capital Planning Commission had previously approved a plan to locate the Stadium at the end of East Capital Street. He stated that this site would be large enough for a stadium seating 50,000 but would not be adequate for 100,000, and that if it is necessary to select another site, he considered that it should also be submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts for approval.

Interview with Mr. Harry Lindquist regarding Postage Stamp Design.

The Chairman told the members of an interview he and the Secretary had with Mr. Harry Lindquist of New York, who has been made Chairman of the Hobbies Committee of the President's People to People Program. Mr. Lindquist is a well-known stamp collector and does not favor getting artists to design stamps. As head of philatilist organizations, Mr. Lindquist works very closely with the Post Office Department and advises both the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and the Post Office Department on stamp designs. It was pointed out that Mr. Lindquist was asked to pass on the design of a stamp which the American Institute of Architects hopes to have issued to commemorate their 150th anniversary in 1957. It was believed that the character of Mr. Lindquist's views might explain somewhat the difficulties which hazv been encountered in getting the Post Office Department and the Bureau of Engraving and Printing to cooperate in an effort to produce better designed stamps. The hope was expressed that the proposed new Executive Order would result in better cooperation on the part of the Post Office Department and the Bureau of Engraving and Printing to obtain better designs for stamps.

Department of Defense-Distinguished Public Service Medal.

Lieut. Colonel James S. Cook, and Mr. Thomas H. Jones, sculptor, of the Heraldic Branch of the Department of the Army, presented plaster models for the Department of Defense Distinguished Public Service Medal. Colonel Cook explained that the medal is designed to be given, along with a certificate to be signed by the Secretary of Defense, to civilians who have performed especially meritorious service to the Department of Defense as a whole, to the Office of the Secretary of Defense, or to more than one of the military establishments. It is stipulated that the nominee shall not derive his principal livelihood from Government employment; he must have served at considerable personal sacrifice and inconvenience motivated by patriotism, good citizenship, and a sense of public responsibility; and have severed all commercial connections from the Department of Defense. The members of the Commission liked the design and the lettering and it was moved, seconded, and carried that the models be approved as the design for the medal.

Smithsonian Institution - National Air Museum-General Mitchell Statue.

The Chairman called on Mr. Bruce Moore, sculptor of the statue of Brigadier General William Mitchell, who desired to submit the final design for the base and the lettering for the General's statue which is to be placed in the National Air Museum. Mr. Moore explained the revisions which he had made in accordance with suggestions made at previous meetings by the Commission of Fine Arts. Some time was also spent in discussing with the sculptor the merits of the various methods of casting the statue and the type of stone to be used for the base. At the end of the discussion, it was moved, seconded and carried that the drawings for the base and lettering be approved as revised.

District of Columbia Highway Department-Interchange at 2nd Street on Southwest Highway- architectural features.

Mr. Gerard Sawyer, Chief, Office of Planning, Design and Engineering; Mr. W.H. Livingston of the firm of Harbeson, Hough, Livingston and Larson, Architects; and Mr. J.H. Herendeen, Engineer, presented renderings in connection with the design of the Southwest Freeway Interchange at 2nd Street, Southwest. Mr. Sawyer stated that this Freeway is a part of the Inner-Belt Loop and the contract for this interchange will be the first to be awarded in that project. Mr. Herendeen stated that the freeway would be built under the railroad tracks and Mr. Orr pointed out that, in that case, it would never be possible to lower the tracks and put them underground. Mr. Sawyer said that this question had been discussed with the railroad officials who were unwilling to cooperate because of the expense involved. After a long discussion of the problem it was moved, seconded, and carried that the design of the architectural features of the interchange be approved. Approval of the inner belt system itself should not be implied by approval of this structure.

In accordance with views previously expressed by the Commission, at discussions involving the design of Areas B and C in the Southwest Redevelopment Project, the Commission was strongly of the opinion that the railroad tracks should be depressed and put underground to permit the best development of this part of the city. It was suggested that a letter be sent to the Highway Department and the National Capital Planning Commission calling their attention to the Commission's views on this problem and making the recommendation that, in planning the interchange where Independence Avenue, the railroad tracks, and South Capital Street come together, the plans should all be detailed in such a way as to facilitate, if possible, the future depression of the railroad tracks. It was agreed that the Chairman and the Vice Chairman would also seek an interview with the Architect of the Capitol for a discussion of this subject. EXHIBIT I.

Shipstead-Luce Submission (informal)-Proposed building for Peoples Life Insurance Company at 25th and New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.

Mr. George W. Petticord, Jr., architect, presented a model of the final design for the proposed building for the Peoples Life Insurance Company at 25th and New Hampshire Avenue, N.W. There was a long discussion about the details of the design and the type of material to be used, after which it was moved, seconded, and carried that the design be approved as submitted.

District of Columbia Auditorium Commission=Location of proposed Auditorium.

The Chairman reported that Mrs. Eugene Meyer Chairman of the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission, had talked with him about possible sites for the auditorium, and wanted to know whether the Commission thought Foggy Bottom or Southwest Washington would be preferable. The Chairman stated that he told Mrs. Meyer that while it was a matter which greatly interested the Commission of Fine Arts, the choice of site was a question to be decided by the National Capital Planning Commission. Mr. Finley asked Mrs. Meyer if she would like to meet with the Commission but she said that at this time she had nothing to show.

Department of the Interior- National Capital Parks-Netherlands Carillon

The Chairman told the members that on November 20, the day following the meeting of the Commission, the Netherlands Ambassador was visiting the office to introduce Mr. Boks, the Duth Architect who was designing the tower for the Carillon which was presented to the United States by the people of The Netherlands. The Ambassador was asked if he wished to come to the meeting but declined because he had nothing to show the members formally as yet.

Shipstead-Luce Submissions (formal)

The following submissions were approved: S.L. 1917; 1921; 1927; 1929; and 1931. S.L. 1923 and 1924 were approved with recommendation for submission of a design with better window spacing; and S.L. 1925 was approved for the use of blue or black letters. In S.L. 1926 which involved replacing an awning with a different style, it was suggested that the same style be used. S.L. 1928 was disapproved as was S.L. 1930, in which it was suggested that the sign text be simplified. Fuller details exist in the individual files on these cases. EXHIBIT J.

Meeting adjourned at 5:12 o'clock.

Respectfully submitted

L. R. Wilson
Secretary

HARRISON & ABRAMOVITZ
Architects

630 Fifth Avenue
New York 20, New York

November 16,1956

Mr. David Finley
Commission of Fine Arts
7000 Interior Department Building
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear David:

I am partially back in the Doctor's hands - this, and pressure, mean that I will not be able to carry the load that all of you are so generously carrying on the Commission. I have tried, but each time it comes up there seems to be another headache here.

I am just sending you this note with the hope that, if you want to discuss with the other members when and how I could be replaced, you would have the necessary 'dope'.

I talked to Ned Purves the other day and asked him to talk to you confidentially about any possibilities the Institute might want to suggest to you.

Naturally, if there is any energy left, I shall take up the fight for the Commission and may be of more help outside than inside because I feel very strongly about this and am hopeful that, with the new Administration, we may be able to give you real support.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

/s/ Wally

Wallace K. Harrison

Exhibit A

HARRISON & ABRAMOVITZ
Architects

680 Fifth Avenue
New York 19, New York

November 10, 1965

Mr. David Finley
Commission of Fine Arts
7003 Interior Department Building
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear David:

I am partially back in the office today - this
and pressure. mean that I will not be able to carry the
load that all of you are so generously carrying on the
Commission. I have tried, but each time it comes up there
seems to be another headache here.

I am just sending you this note with the hope that,
if you want to discuss with the other members when and
how I could be replaced, you would have the necessary "dope".

I talked to Ned Purves the other day and asked him to
talk to you confidentially about any possibilities the
Institute might want to suggest to you.

Naturally, if there is any energy left, I shall take
up the fight for the Commission and may be of more help
outside than inside because I feel very strongly about this
and am hopeful that, with the new Administration, we may be
able to give you real support.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

/s/ Wally

Wallace K. Harrison

Exhibit A

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING
WASHINGTON 25, D.C.

27 November 1956

Dear Wally:

I have received your letter of November 16th which I read to the members of the Commission at our meeting last week. They were all extremely sorry, as I am, to know that you are back in the hands of the doctor.

We all agreed that we do not want you to feel any pressure insofar as attending meetings of the Commission of Fine Arts is concerned. We realize how difficult it is to come from New York to Washington for these meetings and we much prefer to have you continue your membership on the Commission, at least for the present, and let us feel free to write you or come to New York to see you when your advice can be of help in particular situations. I know that you are deeply interested in the work of the Commission and all of us would like to keep you as part of it.

I should add that in asking you to be a member of the Committee on Fine Arts, which the President has asked me to organize as part of his people-to-people program, I did not really expect you to take an active part and hope you will accept with that understanding, My Fine Arts Committee includes Architecture and I am hoping that arrangements may be made to send abroad the exhibition of Architectural Drawings which will be shown in the National Gallery during the Centennial Celebration of the American Institute of Architects next May. The most I shall do is to ask your advice occasionally and I promise not to add to your burdens.

With kind regards in which all the members of the Commission join, I am

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

Mr. Wallace Harrison
630 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York

Exhibit B

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
FOOD ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT BUILDING
WASHINGTON 25, D.C.

17 November 1945

Dear Sally:

I have received your letter of November 16th which I read to the members of the Commission at our meeting last week. They were all extremely sorry, as I am, to know that you are back in the hands of the doctor.

We all agreed that we do not want you to feel any pressure to get as attending meetings of the Commission of Fine Arts in Washington. We realize how difficult it is to come from New York to Washington for these meetings and we much prefer to have you continue your membership on the Commission, at least for the present, and let us feel free to write you or come to New York to see you when your advice can be of help in particular situations. I know that you are deeply interested in the work of the Commission and all of us would like to keep you as part of it.

I should add that in asking you to be a member of the Committee on Fine Arts, which the President has asked me to organize as part of his people-to-people program, I did not really express you to take an active part and hope you will accept with that understanding. My Fine Arts Committee includes Architecture and I am hoping that arrangements may be made to send abroad the exhibition of Architectural Drawings which will be shown in the National Gallery during the Centennial Celebration of the American Institute of Architects next May. The most I shall do is to ask your advice occasionally and I promise not to add to your burdens.

With kind regards in which all the members of the Committee join, I am

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

Mr. Wallace Harrison
630 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York

Exhibit C

APPENDIX 1

4. REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS SINCE 10 OCTOBER 1956 MEETING:

SL 1879 1329 E St., NW - 1 single-faced sign for Munsey Trust Co. Approved as revised on drawing dated 9/25/56, 23 Oct. 1956.

*SL 1912 715-4th St., NW - 2-story office & film exchange bldg. for Columbia Pictures Corp. - Returned for conference. See attached letter dated 15 October 1956, 10 Oct. 1956.

SL 1914 1303 E St., NW - Install show window. 23'-9" wide show window to extend 3' beyond bldg. line - Disapproved, 14 Nov. 1956.

SL 1915 2214 Va. Ave., NW - Addn. & alterations to dwelling - Approved, 23 Oct. 1956.

SL 1916 1337 E St., NW - Auto parking garage - Design of facade approved as indicated on drawing #5 dtd. 10/22/56. Recommend omission of limestone slabs in open space above spandrels located between columns designated "B" & "E" on plan, 25 Oct. 1956.

SL 1918 2930 Macomb St., NW - Apply asphalt shingle roof over existing roof - Approved, 23 Oct. 1956.

SL 1919 4155 Linnean Ave., NW - 5' brick & wrought iron fence & 6'-13" retaining wall - Approved, 25 Oct. 1956.

SL 1920 4155 Linnean Ave., NW - Build 1 chimney with a 9"x13" T. C. Flue lining at east wall of maintenance bldg. - Approved, 25 Oct. 1956.

SL 1922 1751 F St., NW - 1 single-faced, 2'x11'-7" green neon sign - Approved, 29 Oct. 1956.

*Pending

EXHIBIT C

APPENDIX 2

5. REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS SINCE 10 OCTOBER 1956 MEETING:

OG 1562 1058-76 30th St., NW - Garage for the Golden Commissary Corp. - Disapproved. See attached letter dated 8/7/56, 7 Aug. 1956. (For latest action, see ltr. dtd. 11 Oct. 1956 to President of D. C. Board of Commissioners)

OG 1646 2500 Q St., NW - Addn. to present underground garage for Carlyn Apts. - Approved, 16 Oct. 1956

OG 1647 2706 Dumbarton Ave., NW - 6' brick wall between 2704 & 2706 Dumbarton Ave., NW - Approved, 16 Oct. 1956

OG 1648 2703 Dumbarton Ave., NW - Remove roof from rear porch. Repair porch fl. & steps. Bld. new masonry piers for porch support. Remove exist. wood columns - Approved, 16 Oct. 1956

OG 1649 1525-35th St., NW - Rev. of permit B-10085 to indicate installation of wood railing around 2nd fl. uncovered open deck - Approved, 16 Oct. 1956

OG 1650 2519 Q St., NW - Erect front steps. 4'-9" wide entrance steps will project 3' beyond bldg. line - Approved, 16 Oct. 1956

OG 1651 2521 Q St., NW - Erect front steps. 4'-9" wide entrance steps will project 3' beyond bldg. line - Approved, 16 Oct. 1956

OG 1652 2523 Q St., NW - Same as above

OG 1653 2808 R St., NW - 2-story & basement, brick & cinder-block dwelling - Approved as revised 11/6/56, 7 Nov. 1956

OG 1654 2810 R St., NW - Same as 1653

OG 1655 2812 R St., NW - Same as 1653

OG 1656 2814 R St., NW - Same as 1653

OG 1657 2816 R St., NW - Same as 1653

OG 1658 1529-29th St., NW - Rev. to OG 1582 for addn. to bldg. - Approved, 16 Oct. 1956

OG 1659 2816 R St., NW - 1 single-faced, 18 sq-ft construction sign - Disapproved. Wording inappropriate. Recommend omission of all but identification of contractor and architect, 16 Oct. 1956

EXHIBIT D

OG 1660 3300 "O" St., NW - Install steel steps in rear in accordance with plans & the D. C. Bldg. Code - Approved, 16 Oct. 1956

OG 1661 2808-16 R St., NW - Raze storage bldg. & shed, brick; not condemned by D. C. - Approved, 30 Oct. 1956

OG 1662 2911 P St., NW - Erect brick wall 2' high on inner edge of sidewalk; pave parking area with brick & replace exist. steps. Erect wrought iron rail on wall - Approved, 23 Oct. 1956

OG 1663 3265 N St., NW - Rev. to bldg. permit #13380; change 2 doors into 1 large door in garage - Approved, 23 October 1956

OG 1664 3324-26 M St., NW - 1 single-faced, brown & white sign, $1\frac{1}{4}$'x17' - Approved, 7 Nov. 1956

OG 1665 1632-30th St., NW - Rebuild front entrance porch & steps - Approved, 23 Oct. 1956

OG 1666 2809 Dumbarton Ave., NW - Addn. to exist. dwelling; extend length of dining rm. by moving portion of an exterior wall; rearrange kitchen - Approved, 23 Oct. 1956

OG 1667 1632-32nd St., NW - Cut down existing window opening & install new door to basement; bld. new areaway & steps - App., 30 Oct. 1956

OG 1668 3277 Prospect Ave., NW - Install 2 fixtures on dwelling (lamps) - Approved, 30 October 1956

OG 1669 1255 Wisc. Ave., NW - 5' sapling fence - Approved, 30 Oct. 1956

OG 1671 3312 R St., NW - Addn. of 1 rm. to 3rd fl. of existing bldg. - Approved, 30 Oct. 1956

OG 1672 1514-30th St., NW - 1 2-story & basement, brick dwelling - Approved, 30 Oct. 1956

OG 1673 1516-30th St., NW - 2-story & basement, brick dwelling - Approved, 30 Oct. 1956

OG 1674 3222 Scott Pl., NW - 7' wood fence; concrete, brick & flagstone paving (uncovered) steps; 11" high brick coping - App., 30 Oct. 1956

OG 1676 3411 Dent Pl., NW - 6' wood fence - Approved, 30 Oct. 1956

OG 1677 3421 "O" St., NW - Remove interior partitions & build new partitions. 1 new window at rear - Approved, 30 Oct. 1956

OG 1678 1572-74 33rd St., NW - Use shingle tile on front slope of the roof instead of tin - Approved, for shingle tile, 7 Nov. 1956

OG 1680 3206 Grace St., NW - Replace exist. decayed wood door & jambs with new wood door, jambs & sidelights--no chg. in masonry opening. Also remove exist. single door & install window--no chg. in masonry width of opening - Approved; subject to introduction of 1 vertical muntin in each side light & 3 vertical muntins in door; also 3 lights in each side transom & 5 lights in center transom, 7 Nov. 1956

OG 1682 1647-34th St., NW - Build 6' brick garden wall at rear of bldg. - Approved, 7 Nov. 1956

OG 1683 2816 R St., NW - 1 single-faced, 12 sq-ft construction sign - Approved, 7 November 1956

OG 1684 1238-31st St., NW - Rev. to permit #B-17929 to change proposed arches to single arches - Approved, 13 Nov. 1956

OG 1686 3261 K St., NW - Build concrete base on exist. roof & install grain drier - Approved, 13 Nov. 1956

OG 1687 1238-31st St., NW - Raze rear portion of church; not condemned by D. C. - Approved, 13 November 1956

OG 1689 2912 "O" St., NW - Erect 1-family brick residence - Approved, 13 Nov. 1956

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

3 December 1956

Dear Mr. Commissioner:

In September 1950, Public Law 808, 81st Congress, created a District known as Old Georgetown, and defined its boundaries. Within these boundaries the law seeks to preserve "the type of architecture used in the National Capital in its initial years." The law names the Commission of Fine Arts as the qualified agency to decide and report to the District Commissioners as to whether the materials and exterior design for a building proposed for remodelling or erection in the Georgetown area meets the requirements of the law; and to recommend changes, if any are "necessary and desirable", to preserve the historic and architectural character of the Old Georgetown District. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized by law 808 to take such actions as in their judgment "are right and proper" on the findings of the Commission of Fine Arts.

The law, as you know, also authorizes the Commission of Fine Arts to appoint a committee of three architects who shall serve as a Board of Review and advise the Commission of Fine Arts in writing regarding designs and plans referred to the Commission. We have, so far, been able to secure well qualified architects who for more than six years now have devoted one afternoon each week, at no expense to the Government, in performing this public service. It is, as I am sure you will agree, asking a great deal of these architects to devote so much of their time to this work without compensation. While they are willing to do this, they believe that in every instance where their recommendations are overruled eithe by the Commission of Fine Arts or the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, they are entitled to the courtesy of a report on the matter, stating the reasons for the action taken. Insofar as the Commission of Fine Arts is concerned, we always discuss these matters with the Advisory Architects, and almost without exception, find ourselves in agreement with their recommendations.

The number of cases where their recommendations and the Commission of Fine Arts have been overruled is comparatively small. It has been done, however, and when it has occurred, the projects involved have been large or important ones. For example, there was the recent case of the proposed storage garage for the Golden Commissary Corporation, in which the Board of Advisory Architects and also the Commission of Fine Arts recommended that greater attention should be paid to harmonizing the exterior design and materials used with existing buildings in Georgetown. The Commission recognized, of course, the need for storage facilities and that the zoning law permitted such a building to be erected within the Georgetown area.

Dear Mr. Commissioner:

In September 1950, Public Law 808, 81st Congress, created the Georgetown as Old Georgetown, and defined its boundaries. Within these boundaries, the law seeks to preserve "the type of architecture used in the National Capital in its initial years." The law assigns the Commissioner of this City the qualified agency to receive and report to the District Commissioners as to whether the proposals and exterior design for a building proposed for reconstructing of erection in the Georgetown area meets the requirements of the law; and to recommend changes, if any are "necessary and desirable", to preserve the historic and architectural character of the Old Georgetown District. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized by law 808 to take such actions as in their judgment "are right and proper" on the findings of the Commission of Fine Arts.

The law, as you know, also authorizes the Commission of Fine Arts to appoint a committee of three architects who shall serve as a Board of Review and advise the Commission of Fine Arts in writing regarding designs and plans referred to the Commission. We have, so far, been able to secure well qualified architects who for more than six years now have devoted one afternoon each week, at no expense to the Government, to performing this public service. It is, as I am sure you will agree, asking a great deal of these architects to devote so much of their time to this work without compensation. While they are willing to do this, they believe that in every instance their recommendations are overruled either by the Commission of Fine Arts or the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. They are entitled to the courtesy of a report on the matter, stating the reasons for the action taken. Whether as the Commission of Fine Arts is concerned we always discuss these matters with the Advisory Architects, and almost without exception find ourselves in agreement with their recommendations.

The number of cases where their recommendations and the Commission of Fine Arts have been overruled is comparatively small. It has been done, however, and when it has occurred, the projects involved have been large or important ones. For example, there was the recent case of the proposed storage garage for the Golden Gormandary Corporation, in which the Board of Advisory Architects and also the Commission of Fine Arts recommended that greater attention should be paid to harmonizing the exterior design and materials used with existing buildings in Georgetown. The Commission recognized, of course, the need for storage facilities and that the zoning law permitted such a building to be erected within the Georgetown area.

Exhibit A

When the Advisory Architects inquired of me as to the reason why the recommendations made by them and the Commission of Fine Arts had been overruled, I was unable to give the information requested. In order that the record in this case may be completed and that I may be in position to comply with what I consider to be a reasonable request on the part of the Advisory Architects, I would be glad if you will send me a statement in regard to the action of the Commissioners in this instance, and in any future cases where the recommendations of the Commission of Fine Arts are overruled. Otherwise, I fear I shall have trouble in the future, as I have had in the past, in securing qualified architects to act on the Board of Review.

The Georgetown Act imposes a heavy duty upon the Commission of Fine Arts. We are conscious, however, of our responsibility in carrying out the mandate imposed by the law but feel sure we could do so with the cooperation of all concerned.

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

Honorable Robert E. McLaughlin
Commissioner
District of Columbia
Washington, D. C.

cc- Brig. Gen. Thomas A. Lane
Mr. Cabell Gwathmey

Exhibit E

Honorable Joseph E. McLaughlin
3 December 1936

When the Advisory Architects inquired of me as to the reason why the recommendations made by them and the Commission of Fine Arts had been overruled, I was unable to give the information requested. In order that the record in this case may be completed and that I may be in position to comply with what I consider to be a reasonable request on the part of the Advisory Architects, I would be glad if you will send me a statement in regard to the action of the Commissioners in this instance, and in any future cases where the recommendations of the Commission of Fine Arts are overruled. Otherwise, I fear I shall have trouble in the future, as I have had in the past, in securing qualified architects to act on the Board of Review.

The Georgetown Act imposes a heavy duty upon the Commission of Fine Arts. We are conscious, however, of our responsibility in carrying out the mandate imposed by the law but feel sure we could do so with the cooperation of all concerned.

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

Honorable Joseph E. McLaughlin
Commissioner
District of Columbia
Washington, D. C.

cc- Brig. Gen. Theron A. Lane
Mr. Cabell Sweeney

Exhibit E

29 November 1956

Dear George:

In accordance with your request when we talked together last week, I am sending you herewith certain information with reference to the building of a tunnel under the Potomac River in the neighborhood of Constitution Avenue.

The enclosed estimates for constructing a tunnel or a bridge, which have been furnished me by the National Park Service, indicate that the cost of a tunnel is not excessive as compared with a bridge. In addition, I am also enclosing a copy of a statement prepared by Mr. Ole Singstad, Consulting Engineer, who is considered by many to be the world's outstanding tunnel expert. This statement was personally presented by Mr. Singstad to a Subcommittee of the District of Columbia Committee, House of Representatives, during the closing days of the 84th Congress. From the attached estimate you will note that a 4-lane tunnel, with all essential approach roads, complete in every respect to carry traffic, will cost $24,027,000, based upon estimates prepared by Mr. Singstad. The cost should be borne by the Federal Government since the tunnel and its approaches would be located entirely on land owned by the United States Government.

One of the Nation's leading firms of traffic consultants, Wilbur Smith and Associates, which was retained by the National Capital Planning Commission to advise them in this matter, stated that a 4-lane tunnel would be sufficient to carry the traffic that should be permitted to enter the City at this location, as you will see from the attached letter to the National Capital Planning Commission. The tunnel location and system of connecting roads on both sides of the River have been approved by the National Capital Planning Commission. Such a tunnel as designed by Mr. Singstad, with approach roads developed by the National Capital Planning Commission, would have a total of 6 grade separation structures, whereas the proposed bridge would require 14 grade separation structures, according to a plan also approved by the National Capital Planning Commission.

I understand that a 6-lane bridge, at approximately the same site, would cost about $21,821,000. The bridge which is proposed for construction at the Constitution Avenue location has been approved as an element of the inter-state highway system and, as such, would be built with Federal aid funds in accordance with the provisions of the recently enacted Federal Aid Highway Act which provides up to 90% of the cost of Federal Aid Highway projects. As an element of the inter-state highway system, it would be necessary to [illegible] truck access to this bridge. You will remember that the President, in approving the plan for the bridge at this location, stated

Exhibit F

trucks should be prohibited on the bridge and its approaches." I have enclosed a copy of the statement issued by the President when he signed the bill. It would appear to me that there is a basic conflict between instructions issued by the President and an operational procedure which would permit trucks on the proposed bridge structure.

There are, as you know, plans for other bridges crossing the Potomac River to serve the central portion of the City, such as the proposed bridge at Roaches Run and the Three Sisters bridge, a short distance above Key Bridge. I understand that Federal Aid Highway funds, above referred to, could be made available for a bridge at Roaches Run which would give us a much needed river crossing serving the central portion of the city, in addition to the tunnel, and would have a further advantage of deflecting much of the heavy inter-state truck traffic away from the White House and around the City of Washington.

The Commission of Fine Arts has consistently advocated a tunnel rather than a bridge at the Constitution Avenue crossing. We feel that it is of the utmost importance to preserve the beauty which obtains at present in the area surrounding the Lincoln Memorial, the Memorial Bridge, the Arlington National Cemetery, the Marine Memorial and Theodore Roosevelt Island. The beauty of this important area would be less marred by a tunnel, whereas another bridge at this point would seriously disturb the harmony that exists at present in the Lincoln Memorial area.

I hope that you will bring these facts to the attention of the members of the Federal City Council. I know of their deep interest in preserving the beauty of Washington and the monumental character of areas such as that surrounding the Lincoln Memorial. These areas belong to all the people of this country and each year draw millions of visitors to Washington to see their Capital City. Your support and that of the Federal City Council would be of the greatest value in resolving the difficulties of providing another crossing in the Constitution Avenue area by substituting a tunnel for a bridge as outlined above.

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

Honorable George A. Garrett
Chairman
Federal City Council
719 - 15th Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C.

cc- Honorable Robert [illegible] Fleming
Mr. Harry Thompson

Exhibit F

Wilbur Smith and Associates
Traffic - Parking - Transit - Highways
265 Church Street
New Haven, Connecticut

April 30,1956

SPECIAL DELIVERY

Mr. John Nolen, Jr.
Director, National Capital Planning Commission
Interior Department Building
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Nolen:

On April 27th you forwarded to this office a copy of a letter dated April 26th which Mr. Harland Bartholomew, Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission, had received from Mr. Conrad L. Wirth, Director, National Park Service. In his letter Mr. Wirth asked that Wilbur Smith and Associates, as consultants to the National Capital Planning Commission, be asked to express our current views on a Constitution Avenue crossing of the Potomac River.

Mr. Smith and I have discussed Mr. Wirth's letter by telephone and have carefully reviewed our letters to you dated January 31, 1956 and February 15, 1956, in which we analyzed the traffic capacity of a proposed Potomac River tunnel. We believe that these letters cover the situation rather well. Perhaps we can re-state our views a little more clearly:

1. Our traffic analyses indicate that a bridge or tunnel of unlimited capacity in the vicinity of Constitution Avenue would be the most desirable choice of crossing for approximately 95,000 vehicles each day by 1970. This assumes that access highways would be direct and could effectively accommodate this volume of use.

2. We estimate that a six-lane bridge would have a practical capacity of approximately 75,000 vehicles per day.

3. We estimate that a four-lane tunnel would have a practical capacity of about 40,000 vehicles per day. We have arrived at this value from an analysis of operating characteristics of the Holland and Lincoln Tunnels which serve New York City. Our reasoning, as submitted in our previous letters, is as follows:

   "The Holland Tunnel has a peak hour capacity of about 1,000 vehicles of all classes per lane of tunnel. Peak-hour traffic

Wilbur Smith and Associates
Traffic - Parking - Transit - Highways
[illegible] Church Avenue
New Haven, Connecticut

April 30, 1964

[illegible]

Mr. John Nolen, Jr.
Director, National Capital Planning Commission
Interior Department Building
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Nolen:

On April 27th you forwarded to this office a copy of a letter dated April 26th which Mr. Harland Bartholomew, Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission, had received from Mr. Conrad L. Wirth, Director, National Park Service. In this letter Mr. Wirth asked that Wilbur Smith and Associates, as consultants to the National Capital Planning Commission, be asked to express our current views on a Constitution Avenue crossing of the Potomac River.

Mr. Smith and I have discussed Mr. Wirth's letter by telephone and have carefully reviewed our letters to you dated January 31, 1956 and February 15, 1956, in which we analyzed the traffic capacity of a proposed Potomac River tunnel. We believe that these letters cover the situation rather well. Perhaps we can restate our views a little more clearly:

1. Our traffic analyses indicate that a tunnel of unlimited capacity in the vicinity of Constitution Avenue would be the most desirable choice of crossing for approximately 85,000 vehicles each day in 1975. This assumes that such tunnels would be direct and would efficiently accommodate full volume of use.

2. We estimate that a six-lane bridge would have a practical capacity of approximately 75,000 vehicles per day.

3. We estimate that a four-lane tunnel would have a practical capacity of about 40,000 vehicles per day. We have arrived at this value from an analysis of operating characteristics of the Holland and Lincoln Tunnels which serve New York City. Our reasoning, as submitted in our previous letters, is as follows:

"The Holland Tunnel has a peak hr. capacity of about 1,500 vehicles of all classes per lane of tunnel. Peak-hour traffic

in the Lincoln Tunnel reaches a lane volume of about 1,100 vehicles. The difference is attributed to a smaller proportion of heavy trucks in the Lincoln Tunnel. The Potomac River Tunnel would be called on to accommodate a still smaller volume of trucks, so we have assumed a peak hour lane capacity of 1,200 vehicles through it.

"Traffic at the Lincoln and Holland Tunnels is very heavy during many hours of the day. Peak-hour flows in one direction (2 lanes) are equal to about 3.7 percent of 24-hour traffic crossing the river by means of the Lincoln Tunnel. Peak-hour directional flow through the Holland Tunnel amounts to only 3.3 percent of the 24-hour volume. Daily traffic at each tunnel runs around 60,000 vehicles.

"Potomac River Bridges combined carry a peak-hour directional flow amounting to about 6.3 percent of its total use, and if operated at capacity during peak hours, the facility would accommodate about 38,000 vehicles per day. If traffic became heavy enough to require full tunnel capacity at the peaks, increased demand would result in lengthening of the peaks with a smaller proportion of total traffic passing during the peak hour.

"A volume of 40,000 vehicles per day, then, represents a practical maximum capacity for such a facility in Washington. If crossing demand continued to increase without additional relief, the peak demand would spread out over more hours and off-peak use would increase. Volumes of 50,000 per day represent very high use and considerable congestion. In the case of the Holland and Lincoln Tunnels, the traffic load has reached intolerable proportions. It is only through stringent police regulation and control that present traffic volumes are possible. We do not believe that such conditions would ever be permitted to occur in Washington."

4. We also noted in our letter of February 15,1955, the excellent approach facilities must be provided at both District and Virginia termini of a crossing structure. Regarding the District approach we said:

"At the Washington terminus it would be quite essential that a good connection be made to the Inner Loop express Highway in order that traffic distribute to several access routes into the central business district. Constitution Avenue simply does not have the capacity to absorb the full flow of traffic from a four-lane tunnel."

In the Lincoln Tunnel reduced a new volume of about 1,500 vehicles. The difference is attributed to a smaller reduction of heavy trucks in the Lincoln Tunnel. The decrease in tunnel traffic can be ascribed to a total smaller volume of traffic, as we have assumed a peak hour capacity of 1,200 vehicles using it.

"Traffic on the Lincoln Tunnel's new reversible three-lane tube of the Port Authority Bus Terminal is equal to about 3.7 percent of the total traffic on the Lincoln Tunnel. Peak-hour flows in the three-lane tube are equal to about 3.7 percent of 24-hour flows in the Lincoln Tunnel. Peak-hour diverted traffic through the Holland Tunnel amounts to only 1.3 percent of the 24-hour volume. Daily traffic at each tunnel now amounts to 120,000 vehicles.

"Current five bridges combined carry a two-hour directional flow according to about 6.3 percent of its total use, and it operated at capacity during peak hours, the facility would accommodate about 75,000 vehicles per day. If traffic became heavy enough to require full tunnel capacity at the peak, increased demand would result in lengthening of the peaks with a smaller proportion of total traffic passing during the peak hour.

"A volume of 60,000 vehicles per day, then, represents a practical maximum capacity for such a facility in West Virginia. If growing demand continues to increase vehicle ownership, the weekend demand would spread out over more hours and all-day use would increase. Volumes of 50,000 per day or more also are not inconsistent with considerable congestion. In the case of the Holland and Lincoln Tunnels, the traffic flow is regarded as objectionable proportions. It is well beyond acceptable peaks relative and control that present traffic volumes are reached. We do not believe that conditions would ever be permitted to occur in Charleston."

In also noted in our letter of February 15, 1954, the proposal a separate identified must be provided on both Kanawha and Elk terminal of a commuting character. Regarding the other comments we said:

"At the Pennsylvania terminus it would be quite essential that a connection be made to the Turner Road express highway in order that traffic distribution to several areas routes its central business district. Constitution Avenue simply does not have the capacity to absorb the full flow of traffic from a four-lane tunnel."

In our "Report on Traffic Volumes and Capacity Requirements for Potomac River Bridges and Inner Traffic Loop", June, 1955, p. 45, we discussed the Virginia approaches: "The attractive interchange provided with Arlington Boulevard will likely develop increased traffic loads on the Virginia thoroughfare which is currently saturated during peak traffic hours. It should be noted that between 1948 and 1952 traffic volumes in Arlington Boulevard increased about 140 percent. Normal increases in local Virginia traffic alone will tax the capacities to be provided by the planned widening. The additive bridge traffic would aggravate this condition and restrict operations on the roadway. To repeat, present trans-river traffic combined with the rapidly growing intro-Virginia traffic would absorb the capacity of this important expressway as rapidly as it is provided."

It is clear that either a 4 lane or 6 lane crossing would entail new highway construction if bridge or tunnel capacity is to be fully utilized.

5. Considerations other than capacity are also important at this location. In our letter of January 31, 1955, we made the following observation:

"If a tunnel can be shown to be economically feasible, giving cognizance to its relatively high operating costs, or if aesthetic considerations are sufficient to offset these greater costs, then it can also be considered acceptable from a traffic standpoint. We believe that it may not be necessary or even desirable to provide a six-lane capacity at the Constitution Avenue location, and that more thought might be given to the dispersal rather than concentration of trans-river crossings in order to better solve the approach road problems."

The National Capital Planning Commission has recommended in its Comprehensive Plan that the program of new Potomac River crossings include bridges both above and below the Constitution Avenue site.

If a four-lane tunnel were constructed at Constitution Avenue excess traffic demands would be dispersed to these new crossings.

In summary, there is a need for a major new crossing in the vicinity of Constitution Avenue. Potential demand will exceed the capacity of a six-lane facility by 1970. Capacity of approach facilities is presently critical and to realize full use of a new crossing will require major new construction whether a four lane or six lane structure is built. The Comprehensive Plan adopted by the National Capital Planning Commission provides for several new bridges which will increase river-crossing capacity and afford alternate facilities for excess demand generated at the Constitution Avenue location. We trust that this information meets your needs.

Yours very truly,

WILBUR SMITH AND ASSOCIATES
/s/ F. Houston Wynn

needs.

Yours very truly,

WILBUR SMITH AND ASSOCIATES

May 1954

POTOMAC - CONSTITUTION AVENUE TUNNEL

Statement before Congressional Committee

by

Ola Sinsted

1. In November 1954, I was requested by ~~Mr. Harry F. Thompson, Associate~~ Superintendent, National Capital Parks, and by Mr. Oscar H. Beasley, P.E., Chairman of the Civic Affairs Committee of the District of Columbia Chapter of the National Society of Professional Engineers, to make a study of the feasibility of building a vehicular tunnel under the Potomac River from Constitution Avenue, which would make appropriate connections with the street and highway system in Washington and with the East-West and North-South highways on the Virginia side of the river. It was pointed out to me that there was much opposition to the building of a bridge at this location because of the damage which such a bridge would do to the scenic beauty of the Mall and the memorials on the District side of the river and to the memorials and monuments on the Virginia side, and to the unspoiled natural beauty of Theodore Roosevelt Island in the immediate vicinity.

2. I was informed that some kind of a preliminary tunnel plan had been prepared by someone and the plan and

[illegible] of cost endorsed by [illegible] plan, but no [illegible] was ever made, made available to me. It was reported, however, that the plan had the following cardinal [illegible] South of the Potomac River, on the Virginia [illegible] without the possibility of making suitable connections to the highways near the river on that side. The estimated cost was reported to be about $90,000,000. It soon became apparent to me that this was an ill-considered plan and that it and the excessively high cost figure that went with it had misled many people in policy-making positions, and had seriously confused the issue as to whether this crossing should be by bridge or tunnel, to the detriment of a tunnel crossing.

4 After about two months' study, I developed a plan which, in my opinion, met the requirements as laid down by the National Capital Parks and which appeared to be entirely practicable, and the cost reasonable. This plan was submitted to the National Capital Parks, who liked the plan and who in turn called together a select group of persons interested in the problem to a conference on January 15, 1959, at which conference I presented and explained my tunnel plan. I was unable at that time to give an estimate of cost, as there was not available sufficient information on the character of the river bed through which the tunnel would have to be built, so that a dependable estimate could be made.

is a fact that the nature of the ground has a very important bearing on the cost of a tunnel.

4. The National Capital Parks, at my request, took a core boring at the southerly tip of Theodore Roosevelt Island. This boring established the location of the surface of the rock at that point and also the character of the rock as being of excellent quality. The National Capital Parks also found in the old files a series of complete boring logs made some seventy-five years ago in that very location in connection with bridge studies which had been made at that time. These old borings established the location of the rock surface all the way across the river and agreed with the core boring just taken. The method of construction which I proposed for building the tunnel was discussed with the U.S. District Engineer of the Department of the Army in charge of the Washington District. His office indicated general approval of the proposed method of construction. I was then in a position to make a reliable estimate of the cost of the tunnel.

5. On February 4, 1959, I appeared before another select group called together by the National Capital Parks, and presented my estimate of cost of a four-lane tunnel, which I recommended for adoption. The National Capital Parks had also requested that I prepare a preliminary

[illegible] estimate of cost of a six-lane tunnel, which was also presented at that meeting.

6. At a hearing before the Congressional Sub-Committee on Potomac River crossings held on May 1, 1956, at which I was present, the bridge advocates, represented principally by the District of Columbia Highway Department and their engineers, raised the following objections to the tunnel plan:

(a) High cost.

(b) Objectionable grades and curves.

(c) Danger of flooding the tunnel, requiring a high and costly wall and flood gates.

The bridge advocates also claimed that a four-lane tunnel has a maximum capacity of only 45,000 vehicles per day, and that the capacity per lane in a tunnel is only one-half of that of a lane on a bridge. They also stated that a tunnel is more vulnerable to sabotage than a bridge.

The bridge advocates were talking about a six-lane rather than a four-lane tunnel, and quoted cost estimates ranging from $30,000,000 (between portals) to more than $47,000,000 in the location and generally in accordance with my plan.

7. My estimate of cost of construction of a four-

[illegible] Tunnel of 1,250 feet. [illegible]
[illegible] 4% Grade, 45 Feet, [illegible] and [illegible]
[illegible] a Distance of 1,857 feet. The Baytown Tunnel, a
[illegible] Tube, at Baytown, Texas, has 3.05% grades for a
Distance of 3,110 feet. The Hampton River Tunnel [illegible]
Hampton and Berkeley, Virginia, has 5% grades for a [illegible]
of 2,290 feet and 4.1% grades for an additional
1,150 feet. The Detroit-Windsor Tunnel, a single tube, [illegible]
Detroit, Michigan, and Windsor, Ontario, Canada, has
grades of 5% and 5.2% for a distance of 1,490 feet.
The Posey Tube, a single tube, between Oakland and
Alameda, California, has 4.39% grades for a distance of
2,015 feet and 4.5% grades for a distance of 1,696 feet.
The Brooklyn Tunnel, a single tube, with Boston Harbor,
will carries a greater volume of traffic per lane per
hour than any other tunnel or bridge, has 4.2% grades for
a distance of 2,200 feet and 3.5 grades for a distance of
4,300 feet.

The four major, and much longer, underwriter tunnels in New York, all twin tubes with two lanes of traffic in each direction, such as I propose for the Columbus Ship Tunnel, were planned with grades carefully cut to around 3.5% but there are exceptions to this to take care of local conditions and in the interests of economy. In some cases the grades exceed 4.5%, and in one case are as high as 5.15%.

My plan for the proposed Potomac River Tunnel calls for a 5% grade for a distance of 1,000 feet on the Virginia side, where it meets an existing steeper grade of 5.45% on Arlington Boulevard. On the District of Columbia side, I propose a 5% grade for a distance of 1,500 feet. There is a possibility that this grade may be reduced, depending on the outcome of negotiations with the Army Engineers regarding possible modifications of the river channel at this point.

It should be borne in mind that the principal North and South interstate trucking route will cross the Potomac River further down stream, and that at Constitution Avenue there will be a relatively small percentage of commercial traffic consisting primarily of buses and light trucks, which, together with passenger cars, will have no difficulty in negotiating the relatively short 5% grades at the speed limit imposed in vehicular tunnels, which is usually established at a maximum of 35 miles per hour. It should also be borne in mind that this speed is recognized by traffic engineers as giving the maximum capacity per lane on any highway.

The Potomac River at Constitution Avenue is narrow and the depth of the channel is less than that under which any other major vehicular tunnel has been built. For these reasons the tunnel will be shorter than all other tunnels,

with one exception, and the approach grades will be short. Short approach grades can be made steeper than long ones without reducing the capacity of the tunnel roadway. By the use of the most economical method of construction adapted to the site, the cost of construction can be kept low. The bridge advocates' fear that the grades are too steep under my proposed tunnel plan is unwarranted, on the basis of actual operating experience on existing tunnels.

9. Regarding curvature, my plan calls for two curves in the tunnel, one near the District shore of the river, having a radius of about 2,000 feet, and one near the Virginia shore, having a radius of about 1,200 feet, separated by a straight alignment for a distance of about 700 feet. These curves are much flatter than curves in the Holland Tunnel, which has radii as low as 300 feet and 345 feet, and in the Lincoln Tunnel, where there are radii as low as 650 feet for a distance of more than 1,000 feet, and in the Queens-Midtown Tunnel, where radii as low as 450 feet and 500 feet exist on distances of several hundred feet. All three of these tunnels carry large volumes of traffic. In the case of the Lincoln and Holland Tunnels, the traffic in 1955 exceeded 20,000,000 vehicles in each. The bridge advocates' objection to the curvature in the proposed Potomac River Tunnel is, therefore, unwarranted, based on actual operating experience with vehicular tunnels.

10. The bridge advocates have raised the preposterous

objection to the tunnel plan that it will require a dike wall down to rock, and flood gates at the cost of millions of dollars to prevent flooding of the tunnel on the District side. The bridge advocates, including their tunnel advisers, appear to be unaware of that feature of my plan which calls for raising the elevation of the ground in the vicinity of the south of the tunnel on the District side, with an embankment having gentle slopes and appropriately treated by landscape architecture, so that the entrance and exit of the tunnel will be above the flood stage of the Potomac River. This will be accomplished by raising that part of the ground immediately surrounding the tunnel roadways to an elevation of 22 feet above normal water level in the Potomac. The top of this fill will be about 9 feet lower than the terrain immediately surrounding the Lincoln Memorial and will in no way detract from the general appearance of the neighborhood.

The elevation of Columbia Island, where the western approach to the tunnel is located, is above flood stage of the Potomac River.

The ventilation chambers housing the fans and motors will be located under ground as was done on the Manhattan end of the Brooklyn-Battery Tunnel in New York. The air intakes and exhausts will extend eight fee above ground or to any greater height which the architects and landscape architects may deem most appropriate to the locality.

I point out that hole boring of the ground in the immediate vicinity of the tunnel entrance and exit on the district side follows the procedure on a smaller scale on two of the large New York vehicular tunnels of which I was in charge, namely, the New Jersey exit of the Holland Tunnel and the Queens end of the Queens-Midtown Tunnel. The Holland Tunnel, which was the pioneer vehicular tunnel built for automobile traffic, was opened to traffic in 1927, and during the intervening years the New York area has been struck by several hurricanes. Neither that tunnel nor the Queens-Midtown Tunnel, opened to traffic in 1940, has ever been flooded. There is no need for any cut-off walls nor any flood gates, such as the bridge advocates have talked about as running into a cost of many millions of dollars, and there will be no flooding of the tunnel.

11. The bridge advocates' statement that a tunnel is more vulnerable to sabotage than a bridge is unconvincing and unrealistic. I can cite one subaqueous vehicular tunnel where actual destruction was attempted, but unsuccessfully, during World War II.

In 1930, I was asked to design a vehicular tunnel under the Scheldt River at Antwerp, Belgium. That tunnel was opened to traffic in 1933. During World War II, when the German army invaded Belgium, the Allied armies, retreating before them, tried to blow up the tunnel to impede the rapid advance of the enemy. The tunnel, however, refused to be destroyed.

[illegible] that the Germans were being driven back by our [illegible] they in turn tried to blow up the tunnel. It may be reasonably asserted that the Germans had no sentimental reasons against destroying the tunnel if they could; but again, the tunnel withstood the explosions which were set off, and only superficial damage to the interior ceiling of the tunnel and some ventilation equipment in the buildings resulted. This fact that a tunnel is more vulnerable to destruction by shooting than a bridge is unwarranted and erroneous.

12. The bridge advocates claim that the capacity per lane in a tunnel is only one-half of the capacity per lane on a bridge. This is contrary to the facts as demonstrated by traffic statistics on major tunnels and bridges. To cite a few examples, using the 1955 traffic counts, the following are the actual figures:

Facility	No. of Traffic Lanes	Total No. of Vehicles Per Year	No. of Vehicles Per Year Per Lane	Average No. of Vehicles Per Year Per Lane
George Washington Bridge, N.Y. - N.J.	8	35,774,780	4,471,838	12,252
Triborough Bridge New York City	8	43,736,123	5,467,015	14,978
Whitestone Bridge New York City	6	27,983,604	4,663,934	12,774
Lincoln Tunnel N.Y. - N.J.	4	21,341,142	5,335,285	14,617
Holland Tunnel N.Y. - N.J.	4	20,237,533	5,059,383	13,861
Sumner Tunnel Boston	2	12,094,107	6,047,053	16,567
Gen. A. Posey Tunnel Oakland-Alameda, Calif. (1953)	2	10,958,830	5,479,415	15,012

*This is an average of 58,470 vehicles per day for the 365 days of the year, as contrasted with the bridge advocates' claim that a four-lane tunnel has a maximum capacity of 45,000 vehicles per day.

It should be noted that the number of vehicles per lane per day listed above is an average over the entire 365 days of the year, rather than a maximum on any one single day. The maximum observed vehicles per hour in two lanes of one tube are as follows:

Queens-Midtown Tunnel - 2,970

Sumner Tunnel - 2,600

Holland Tunnel - 2,496

Lincoln Tunnel - 2,476

To illustrate the effect on the volume of traffic per lane where there is a lower percentage of commercial traffic, the following figures are illuminating. The Holland Tunnel has 25.3% truck and a total of 26.1% commercial traffic. The Lincoln Tunnel has 23% commercial traffic of which 9.1% is buses, and the Queens-Midtown has 10.6% commercial traffic. The effect of the lower percentage of commercial traffic in the Queens-Midtown Tunnel in increasing its capacity is illustrated by the greater volume per lane per hour, as stated above. The George Washington Bridge has 8.9% commercial traffic, the Triborough Bridge 6.1%, and the Whitestone Bridge 4.3%. In the Queens-Midtown Tunnel, there have been numerous one-hour periods when the traffic in the two lanes of one tube exceeded 2,300 vehicles per hour, or 1,400 vehicles per hour per lane. The contention of the bridge advocates that a tunnel has a much lower capacity per lane than a bridge is contrary to the facts and is not supported by operating statistics on heavily traveled bridges and tunnels.

23. A Four-lane Tunnel Versus a Six-lane Tunnel. I have recommended a four-lane tunnel at the Constitution Avenue location and believe that a six-lane facility at this location, which is only about 1,000 feet upstream from the six-lane Memorial Bridge, would be unwise and would concentrate more traffic in this immediate vicinity than the street and highway system of the City of Washington could handle without serious congestion. During the past 35 years, New York City has

four-lane arteries, on the basis that the street system at that point of the city could operate without undue congestion. When traffic increases to the capacity of the facility, it is considered better practice to build another crossing at a suitable distance away so as to diffuse the traffic rather than concentrating an excessively large volume in one area, which has proven to be very costly and inconvenient on the older bridges in that city. The principle of diffusing traffic has proven very successful. It is my firm conviction, based upon my experience in planning, building and operating major relief tunnels in large cities over the past 35 years, that a four-lane tunnel is all that the Constitution Avenue location can stand without creating very undesirable traffic conditions, especially on the Washington side of the river.

4. A factual analysis of the objections to a tunnel voiced by the bridge advocates shows that they are all without foundation. It appears that the only remaining reason for building a bridge is that the bridge promoters wish to build a bridge. Certainly it cannot be said that we, as a nation, have become so poor that we have to build a [illegible] when a tunnel is available and [illegible]. Actual costs in the Detroit area for 2-mile of tunnel and 2-mile of bridge, including approaches, show that the difference in cost between a tunnel and a bridge

# # # #

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

I have today signed H. R. 1950, a bill authorizing the construction of two bridges over the Potomac River, one from a point at or near Jones Point, Virginia, and the other from the vicinity of Constitution Avenue in the District of Columbia to the Virginia side.

I have signed this enrolled bill because it provides, in Title I, a compromise solution for the long-standing controversy as to the location of a central area bridge across the Potomac. The bill, however, contains serious defects which should be corrected as soon as possible. Certain of the defects can be corrected by executive action in the form of instructions, whereas others will require amendment of the legislation.

Title I of the enrolled bill, in providing for the construction of the central area bridge by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, fails to provide for adequate recognition and adjustment of the relationship of the bridge, together with its approaches and connecting roads, to existing and potential improvements on park lands. The bridge and bridgeheads, with its high traffic volume, will have a serious impact on some of the most important of the National Memorials. It can affect importantly the effectiveness of the memorial concept of Arlington Memorial Bridge, which symbolizes the reunion of the North and South and provides a monumental approach to Arlington National Cemetery. It can infringe upon the Water Gate design as a monumental entrance to the Mall from

Exhibit F-3

[illegible] River. Most serious of all would be the effect of [illegible] bridge on the beautiful setting of the Lincoln Memorial.

In order to minimize the possible impairment of the monumental design and artistic setting of the Lincoln Memorial and other monumental structures in that area, the Secretary of the Interior should continue to keep control and jurisdiction over all park lands in the vicinity of the bridge except the actual bridge structure and the road and street surface between curb necessary for maintenance by the District of Columbia. The Secretary of the Interior also should be authorized to approve all plans for the bridge and for approach roads and interchanges at both ends of the bridge since park structures and land are involved. Trucks should be prohibited on the bridge and its approaches, and all passenger-carrying busses now utilizing the Arlington Memorial Bridge should be required to use the new bridge upon its completion.

I feel that Title II of H. R. 1960 improperly vests in the Secretary of the Interior the responsibility for the construction, maintenance, and operation of the Jones Point Bridge. There is, in my opinion, no logical basis for the performance of these functions by that Department since it is not a construction agency and the bridge will not primarily concern or serve areas administered by that Department. The responsibility for the construction, maintenance, and operation of this bridge should be placed in the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, as in the case of bridges of the Department of the Army.

I am requesting the Secretary of the Interior to submit to me recommendations for Executive action and amendments of the act necessary to correct these defects in this legislation.

Mr. George A. Garrett
President
Federal City Council
1404 New York Avenue, NW
Washington 5, D. C.

Dear Mr. Garrett:

It is with pleasure that I send to you enclosed, prints of two plans (one for a proposed tunnel and one for a proposed bridge) which were presented to a special committee of the Federal City Council at a conference held in the Council chambers on January 18, 1957. To accompany the plans is a tabulation of facts and notations relating to some of the more important aspects of the problem of constructing an adequate and appropriate traffic crossing of the Potomac River in the Constitution Avenue Corridor.

Both plans were developed and approved by the National Capital Planning Commission in 1955. All approach roads, interchange loops, secondary bridges and grade separation structures necessary to develop either a tunnel or a bridge as a completely functioning facility are indicated in red. Private lands are indicated in purple. Federal park and parkway land are shown in green. Minor modifications in either plan would in all probability be made if either facility is constructed.

A fully developed 4-lane tunnel is estimated to cost approximately $25,500,000. It is believed that the tunnel estimate could be reduced to $24,000,000. A fully developed 6-lane bridge is estimated to cost approximately $22,000,000.

The public, the press and the Congress have been left with the impression that an imaginary tunnel of some kind would cost an exorbitant amount. Estimates in the amount of $92,812,000, $72,872,000, $60,000,000, $52,000,000, $50,000,000 $47,824,000, $42,000,000, $36,000,000 and $30,000,000 have been presented as the cost of a tunnel by proponents of a bridge. Estimates in the amount of $5,000,000, $7,500,000, $9,500,000, $15,000,000, $18,699,000 and $24,500,000 have also been quoted as the cost of a bridge.

It is unfortunate that the sum total issues involved have been clouded by so many unrealistic cost estimates for both the tunnel and the bridge. Undoubtedly these estimates have played an important part in the presentations that have been made to the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress.

When bridge legislation was considered by the 84th Congress, it is of particular significance that the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress were left with the impression that some kind of a tunnel would

cost between $25,500,000 and $28,000,000 more than a bridge. This figure was not furnished by those of us who support the concept of a tunnel.

Please understand that the only tunnel project that has ever been supported by the National Park Service, the Fine Arts Commission and some 15 other responsible agencies, organizations, and federal commissions concerned with the welfare of the Nation's Capital is a 4-lane tunnel designed and estimated by Mr. Ole Singstad, a tunnel engineer selected and considered to be the world's outstanding tunnel engineer by his own profession. Mr. Singstad has designed and operated more large subaqueous tunnels than any man who has ever lived. Mr. Singstad's estimates have been verified by the firm of Mason and Hanger of New York and Louisville, one of the world's largest tunnel construction companies.

It is a matter of record that the Federal Government is by many laws and Presidential proclamations responsible for the administration and financing of projects and improvements on Federal properties in the District of Columbia and the Washington Metropolitan Area. It is also a matter of record that the Federal agencies responsible for Federal properties have by policy, procedure, and practice assumed these responsibilities. Therefore, it is consistent to suggest that any improvement, including a proposed traffic facility crossing the Potomac River in this location is in no different category than the many miles of Federal parkway and park roads which it would serve to connect as parallel roads on both sides of the River.

It is not inconsistent to suggest or believe that a traffic facility in the location now being considered should be developed in a manner that would be acceptable to the sum total Federal interest as well as the interest of the local community. This procedure is proposed by Senate Bill 944, introduced into the 85th Congress by Senator Joseph O'Mahoney and co-sponsor Senator Paul H. Douglas on January 29, 1957.

It is presumed that the present Engineer Commissioner, the Director of Highways and other District of Columbia authorities will support this legislation since they have, by public pronouncements, subscribed to the principle that a tunnel would be satisfactory to them provided the Federal Government would pay the difference in cost between the tunnel and a bridge. Under the provision of S 944 the District of Columbia would be relieved of any cost for constructing a trafficway in conformity with a plan which they have approved.

Mr. Bartholomew, Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission has requested that his personal comments be included in this letter to the Council. His comments are as follows:

"My comment on this situation and after reading the testimony can be summarized as follows:

"The basic issue in this bridge vs. tunnel discussion is, stated in the simplest possible language:

> Is it either imperative or necessary to concentrate a great volume of river-crossing traffic in the great Federal memorial area?

"The answer is quite plain. It is not imperative.

"The volume of river-crossing traffic is increasing steadily each year. This is due to the increases in population in the Virginia portion of the metropolitan district, especially in the southwest sector. The total anticipated volume and its approximate logical point of entry has been studied by the National Capital Planning Commission with the aid of the best obtainable experts.

"Two clear conclusions reached were:

1. Approximately 14 additional traffic lanes (bridge or tunnel) will be required by 1970.

2. Dispersal of new facilities should be made to avoid over-concentration and consequent congestion.

"To provide 14 new river-crossing traffic lanes requires a program of construction as distinguished from a single facility. The true requirements are:

A. A crossing at Three Sisters
B. A crossing at Constitution Avenue
C. A crossing at Roaches Run

"Each of these crossings could be four lanes since additional capacity is now being provided by reconstruction of present bridges.

"The new metropolitan traffic census and mass transportation study now under way might conceivably alter these requirements but it is perfectly clear that any additional capacity should be provided either at Three Sisters or at Roaches Run rather than at Constitution Avenue, where no new traffic generation will take place. A four lane crossing here is all that will be required, and is certainly all that could be considered as necessary.

"It is respectfully submitted that since a tunnel can provide for cross-river traffic comparable with any bridge, the magnificent character of the memorial area warrants the protection and the preservation that can best be achieved by tunnel construction. It is most clearly and definitely in the public interest."

I would add to Mr. Bartholomew's comments the following observations based upon an actual economic survey of tunnels and bridges in actual operation in New York City covering a period between 1919 and 1939.

High level bridge approaches have a depressing affect on real estate surrounding their approaches.

Real estate values surrounding the approaches to a tunnel, increased very substantially.

A copy of this survey is enclosed. The bargraph of record of impact on the real estate and the tax structure of property in both cases is recorded in the latter part of the survey.

It will be noted that bridgehead properties were depressed as much as 60% whereas properties in the vicinity of the tunnel portals increased by more than 180%.

Comments to the effect that the National Park Service is anti-automobile and anti-bridge can be dismissed by simply noting that the National Park Service has constructed several thousand miles of roads and parkways, hundreds of acres of parking lots, hundreds of bridges and numerous tunnels to accommodate the motoring public.

Those of us who were privileged to appear before the committee of the Council are very grateful for the opportunity to present personally and through supplementary drawings and facts, some of the reasons why we believe a tunnel and not a bridge should be constructed in this location.

May I take this opportunity to thank you and the Council for providing this opportunity and to express the sincere hope that the Federal City Council will, after a careful review of the facts, conclude that a tunnel and not a bridge should be constructed by the Federal Government in the Constitution Avenue Corridor.

Sincerely yours,

Conrad Lautz

Director

Facts and Comments Relating to
Proposals to Construct a Tunnel or Bridge
Across the Potomac River in the
Constitution Avenue Corridor

PROPOSED TUNNEL	PROPOSED BRIDGE
The tunnel would be a 4-lane structure	The bridge would be a 6-lane structure
$25,500,000 estimated cost	$22,000,000 estimated cost
55,000 vehicles per day actual capacity. Based on actual performance of 4-lane tunnels now in operation. From 1955 records of actual performance.	See D. C. estimates for actual capacity
Holland Tunnel, New York City 4 lanes 14,617 - vehicles per lane-per day 56,461 - capacity of 4 lanes per day	George Washington Bridge, New York 12,252 vehicles per lane-per day
Lincoln Tunnel, New York City 4 lanes 13,361 - Vehicles per lane-per day 56,000 - Capacity of 4 lanes per day	Triboro Bridge, New York City 14,978 Vehicles per lane-per day
Sumner Tunnel, Boston, Massachusetts 2 lanes 16,567 vehicles per lane-per day	See D. C. record for local bridge records.
Actual capacity and practical capacity exceeds traffic that could be absorbed in D. C. street system. See Mr. Bartholomew's statement and Wilbur Smith Associates traffic report to verify.	
Trucks, buses and passenger cars would use a tunnel.	President stated that "trucks should not use bridge," as a condition to his approval of a previous bridge authorization in this general location.
5% gradient or less on tunnel approaches.	For comparison, the Connecticut Avenue tunnel constructed by the District Government has approach grades of approximately 7%.
Unobstructed use of River	Bridge would conflict with boat races and water sports.

PROPOSED TUNNEL	PROPOSED BRIDGE
No obstruction of River in time of flood.	Bridge piers obstruct River. Earlier bridge design at this location would raise flood crest by as much as 2'.
Seven feet (7') lift of grade above existing ground on D. C. side - not 22' as suggested by others.	Fourteen (14') or more lift of grade above existing ground on D. C. side to accommodate bridge approaches.
No embankments required on Virginia side. No private lands required for tunnel	High embankments to accommodate double and triple deck bridges on Virginia side. Several acres of private land required on Virginia side.
$125,000 yearly operating cost for tunnel - not $330,000 as stated by others.	$10,000 to $14,000 recent estimate for operating and maintenance of bridge. For comparison: $55,000 actual operating cost for each of two 14th Street bridge spans. $60,000 estimated cost for operating proposed Jones Point Bridge. $60,000 to $70,000 yearly operating cost of Arlington Memorial Bridge.
100% proposed Federal funds for construction and maintenance.	90% Federal funds. 10% D. C. funds plus D. C. total cost for maintenance.
2½ years to construct.	See D. C. estimates.
4.5 miles of approach roads.	5.5 miles of approach roads.
12½% included for engineering and contingencies in tunnel estimate.	12½% or other appropriate percentage should be included for engineering and contingencies in Bridge estimate.
Cost to State of Virginia - None.	Cost to State of Virginia - Substantial.
The following Federal Agencies, Commissions, and Organizations, favor a tunnel: National Park Service Commission of Fine Arts Theodore Roosevelt Commission National Monument Commission Commission of 100 for the Federal City Marine Corps War Memorial Foundation American Society of Landscape Architects Theodore Roosevelt Association American Scenic and Historic Preservation Society Freedom Shrine, Incorporated American Institute of Architects American Society of Professional Engineers	Consult D. C. for list of Bridge proponents.

12:52 Interior-Duplicating Sect., Wash. 25, D. C.

Exhibit F-5

		approach roads carried to grade	Ole Singstad
2,700,000	*	6 - New grade separation structures and approach roads - Both sides of the River	- N. C. P.
100,000	*	Lighting - Approach Roads	- N. C. P.
200,000	*	Landscaping - Approach Roads	- N. C. P.
	*	12½% Engineering & Contingencies included in all estimates	
$ 25,527,000			
1,500,000		Saving for Reduction in Navigation Channel	
$ 24,027,000		TUNNEL ESTIMATE	

Tunnel
Ready to operate - with all essential approach roads, grade separation structures - (6), lighted and landscaped in accordance with plans approved by the National Capital Planning Commission - November 4, 1955

Exhibit F-6

ESTIMATE
for
CONSTRUCTION ACROSS POTOMAC
at
THE POTOMAC RIVER

$ 24,027,000

TUNNEL - 4 LANES

$ 22,527,000	*	Tunnel structure complete with approach roads carried to grade	- Estimated by: Ole Singstad
2,700,000	*	6 - New grade separation structures and approach roads - Both sides of the River	- N. C. P.
100,000	*	Lighting - Approach Roads	- N. C. P.
200,000	*	Landscaping - Approach Roads	- N. C. P.
	*	12½% Engineering & Contingencies included in all estimates	

$ 25,527,000
1,500,000 Saving for Reduction in Navigation Channel

$ 24,027,000 TUNNEL ESTIMATE

Tunnel
Ready to operate - with all essential approach roads, grade separation structures - (6), lighted and landscaped in accordance with plans approved by the National Capital Planning Commission - November 4, 1955

$ 21,321,000

BRIDGE - 6 LANES

$ 8,000,000	*	Bridge Structure River Shore to River Shore - Mr. Masters	- Estimated By: D. C. Govt.
2,000,000	*	Bascule or Draw Span - River Navigation - Mr. Robertson Mr. Lane	- D. C.
1,000,000	*	Access to Theodore Roosevelt Island Vehicle & Pedestrians - Mr. Robertson	- D. C.
3,400,000	*	7 - Approach Roads and Structures Virginia Side - by D.C. - Mr. Sawyer	
340,000	*	Approach Roads - Virginia Side by Virginia - Mr. Sawyer	- D.C.
1,500,000	*	7 - Approach Roads and Structures D. C. Side - Mr. Sawyer	- D.C.
2,196,000	-	12½% Engineering and Contingencies * Same percentage as for tunnel Construction items - Estimates are contract prices only	
200,000	-	Designs - Prestress Concrete	
150,000	-	Lighting	- N. C. P.
975,000		Landscaping - Approach Roads	- N. C. P.
1,500,000		Land Acquisition - Virginia	- Groteclose - Real Estate Office for N. C. P.

$ 21,321,000 - BRIDGE ESTIMATE

Bridge
Ready to operate - with all essential approach roads, grade separation structures (14), lighted and landscaped in accordance with plans approved by the National Capital Planning Commission - April 7, 1955
$ 10,638,000 - Federal contribution on 50/10 formula

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.
30 November 1956

Dear Congressman Thompson:

Thank you for your letter of September 10,1956, requesting the views of the members of the Commission of Fine Arts with reference to the draft of a Joint Resolution, "To amend the Act entitled 'An Act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts,' approved May 17,1910, to provide for the appointment to such Commission of representatives of those American arts and crafts which have no representation on such Commission, to establish a Federal Interagency Committee on the Arts and Crafts, to foster the international interchange of the arts and crafts for peaceful ends, and for other purposes."

The members of the Commission have carefully considered the draft legislation and have asked me to say that it is their opinion that, if such legislation should be enacted, it will change the basic character of the Commission and, to a large extent, destroy its usefulness, without providing effective means for carrying on the work which it has performed during the last 45 years.

When the Commission was established, it was given the duty of advising the Federal Government as to the location and design of public buildings, monuments, etc., and "generally upon questions of art" in specific cases that arise when the Government is spending money for such purposes in the city of Washington or, when the Commission is so directed, outside of Washington, as for instance in the case of the American Battle Monuments Commission. These duties have been enlarged and further defined in three Executive Orders issued by Presidents Taft, Wilson, and Harding, which provide in effect that, when new structures are to be erected in the District of Columbia by the Federal Government or the District Government, and when these structures "affect in any important way the appearance of the city or whenever questions involving matters of art and with which the Federal Government is concerned are to be determined, final action shall not be taken until such plans and questions have been submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts, designated under the Act of Congress of May 17,1910, for comment and advice."

The specific cases which have come before the Commission have involved matters of location and design requiring the expert advice of architects, landscape architects, painters, sculptors and laymen qualified to render advice to the Government on matters within the Commission's terms of reference. The members serve without pay and are glad to give their services on one or two days each month to matters coming before the Commission. In arriving at conclusions involving judgment and expert advice, it is necessary to have an opportunity for discussion and full interchange of views, which is made possible by the fact that the Commission

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.
30 November 1956

Dear Congressman Thomas:

Thank you for your letter of September 10, 1956, requesting the views of the Commission of Fine Arts with reference to the draft of a bill, "To amend the Act entitled 'An Act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts,' approved [illegible], 1910, to provide for the appointment to such Commission of representatives of those American arts and crafts which have no representation on such Commission, to establish a Federal Incorporation for the Arts and Crafts, to foster the interrelationship of the arts and crafts for public use, and for other purposes."

The members of the Commission have carefully considered the draft legislation and have asked me to say that in their opinion, if such legislation were to be enacted, it would change the basic character of the Commission and, to a large extent, destroy its usefulness, without providing effective means for carrying on the work which it has performed during the last 45 years.

When the Commission was established, it was given the duty of advising the Federal Government as to the location and design of public buildings, memorials, etc., and "generally upon questions of a new in specific cases that arise when the Government is spending money for such purposes in the city of Washington or, when the Commission is consulted, elsewhere at Gettysburg, or for instance in the case of the American Battle Monuments Commission." The a duties have been enlarged and further defined in three Executive Orders issued by Presidents Taft, Wilson, and Harding, which provide in effect that, when new structures are to be erected in the District of Columbia by the Federal Government or the District Government, and when these structures "after in any important way the appearance of the city or whenever questions involving matters of art and with which the Federal Government is concerned are to be determined, plans shall not be taken until such plans are under the Act of Congress of May 17, 1910, for comment and advice."

The specific cases which have come before the Commission have involved matters of location and design regarding the proper siting of monuments, Landscape architects, painters, sculptors and lawyer qualified to render advice to the Government on matters within the Commission's terms of reference. The members serve without pay and are glad to give their services on one or two days each month to matters coming before the Commission. In arriving at conclusions involving judgment and expert advice, it is necessary to have an opportunity for discussion and full interchange of views, which is not possible by the fact that the Commission

Exhibit C

is composed of only seven members. This would be difficult, if not impossible, in a body composed of 21 members, as provided by the draft legislation. To replace the Commission of Fine Arts by a larger body for representational purposes, consisting of 21 members, w ould be a retrogressive step in the direction of the 35-member Council of Fine Arts which President Taft abolished in 1909 and which was replaced by the present seven member Commission of Fine Arts in 1910.

The questions that have come before the Commission of Fine Arts have been concerned with the visual, not the performing, arts. There is, therefore, no member of the Commission representing such arts as music, ballet, the theatre, etc., as provided in the draft legislation. If the Federal Government should at any time provide funds for the performance of these arts, especially music and ballet, such funds could be administered to greater advantage by a separate body on the order of the British Arts Council, which is organized to administer government subsidies for the performing arts.

The Commission of Fine Arts is not a contracting agency but was established as an advisory body for the purposes outlined above. I should also add that in establishing the Commission of Fine Arts, it was apparently not the purpose of Congress to constitute a body with responsibility for building up art activities in this country, except as this may result from securing for the Government the finest work obtainable from American artists in the design of Governmental buildings, monuments, parks, medals, also sculpture, painting and other decorations for public buildings. There are already in existence constituted agencies in the various departments and establishments of the Federal Government which can, with adequate financial support, do much for the encouragement of the performing arts, without additional legislation.

In 1953, at the request of the President, the Commission of Fine Arts made a Report to the President on Art and Government, containing detailed recommendations for accomplishing many of the aims implied in the proposed legislation of which you sent us a draft. One recommendation was concerned with the encouragement and exhibition of American art, especially contemporary art and crafts, which the Commission hoped could be done, to a greater extent than at present, by means of loan and permanent exhibitions of the National Collection of Fine Arts, Smithsonian Institution, in a suitable building to be erected for that agency. The National Collection of Fine Arts would thus supplement the important collection of American paintings in the National Gallery of Art, where they are shown with the finest art of other countries. The Commission also recommended that art education in the schools of this country should be furthered by means of slides, films, exhibitions and lectures under the auspices of the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare; also that a building should be erected for a music center

is composed of only seven members. This would be difficult, if not impossible, in a body composed of 11 members, as provided by the Smart legislation. To replace the Commission of Fine Arts by a larger body for representational purposes, consisting of 11 members, would be a retrogressive step in the direction of the 3-member Commission of Fine Arts which President Taft abolished in 1909 and which was replaced by the present seven member Commission of Fine Arts in 1910.

The questions that have come before the Commission of Fine Arts have been concerned with the visual, not the performing, arts. There is, therefore, no member of the Commission representing opera as music, ballet, the theatre, etc., as provided in the Smart legislation. If the Federal Government should at any time provide funds for the performance of these arts, especially music and ballet, such funds could be administered to greater advantage by a separate body on the order of the British Arts Council, which is organized to administer Government subsidies for the performing arts.

The Commission of Fine Arts is not a contracting agency but was established as an advisory body for the purposes outlined above. I should also add that in establishing the Commission of Fine Arts, it was apparently not the purpose of Congress to create a body with responsibility for building up art activities in this country, except as this may result from securing for the Government the finest work obtainable from American artists in the design of Governmental buildings, monuments, parks, medals, also sculpture, painting and other decorations for public buildings. There are already in existence constituted agencies in the various departments and establishments of the Federal Government which can, with adequate financial support, do much for the encouragement of the performing arts, without additional legislation.

In 1923, at the request of the President, the Commission of Fine Arts made a Report to the President on Art and Government, recommending related recommendations for accomplishing many of the aims implied in the proposed legislation of which you sent us a draft. One recommendation was concerned with the encouragement and exhibition of American art, especially contemporary art and crafts, which the Commission hoped could be done, to a greater extent than at present, by means of loan and permanent exhibitions of the National Collection of Fine Arts, Smithsonian Institution, in a suitable building to be erected for that agency. The National Collection of Fine Arts would thus supplement the important collection of American paintings in the National Gallery of Art, where they are shown with the finest art of other countries. The Commission also recommended that art education in the schools of this country should be furthered by means of slides, films, exhibitions and lectures under the auspices of the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare; also that a building should be erected for a music center

in Washington for the performance of concerts, opera, the ballet, etc. We hope that these recommendations may be implemented by appropriate legislation by the Congress.

The Interagency Commission, outlined in the proposed legislation, would seem to be a step towards the creation of a body that would function in much the same manner as Departments of Fine Arts in other countries where art is subsidized and organized to a greater extent than has obtained in the United States. The members of the Commission feel that they cannot recommend such legislation but hope that you will give us an opportunity to discuss with you this and other matters which you have in mind for the advancement of art in this country, especially insofar as Governmental activities are concerned.

The members of the Commission are most appreciative of your own efforts in this connection and asked me to thank you for giving us in advance a draft of the proposed legislation.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

Honorable Frank Thompson, jr
House of Representatives
Washington, D. C.

Honorable Frank Thompson, Jr.
30 November 1956

Dear Mr. Thompson:

The members of the Commission are most appreciative of your own efforts in this connection and asked me to thank you for giving us in advance a draft of the proposed legislation.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

Honorable Frank Thompson, Jr.
House of Representatives
Washington, D. C.

D R A F T

85th Congress H. R. _____

A BILL

To provide for decorative art in Federal buildings.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) it is hereby declared to be the purpose of this Act (1) to encourage the development of a strong and vital American art through maximum use of American artists in the decoration of Federal buildings; (2) to promote the progress of the useful arts; (3) to secure suitable art of the best quality for the decoration of buildings of the Federal Government; (4) to carry out this work in such a way as will best assist in stimulating the development of American art and rewarding the outstanding talent which develops.

(b) As used in this Act---

(1) the term "decorative art work" includes murals, mosaics, paintings, sculpture (including architectural and monumental sculpture), ironwork, pottery, weaving, woodcarving, stonework, and artistic work in other media.

(2) the term "Administrator" means the Administrator of General Services.

(3) the term "Federal agency" means any department, agency, or establishment of the Federal Government.

(c) The Administrator of General Services is authorized to establish a Fine Arts Fund, which shall be available without fiscal year limitation, to be expended at his discretion and with the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts, for suitable decorative art work in public buildings designed for any Federal agency, and constructed under his supervision. There is authorized to be

appropriated to said fund an amount not to exceed $_____*: Provided, That such fund shall be in addition to any appropriation for the design and construction of public buildings or otherwise provided to General Services Administration or any other agency.

(d) In order to secure the participation of the best possible talent under this Act, there shall be established such procedures as may be deemed appropriate by the Administrator and the Commission of Fine Arts to provide for the award of commissions without competition, as well as for the award of commissions through competitions in which artists are invited to compete and are paid for designs submitted.

*Alternate: "not to exceed 1% of the total sum appropriated in any fiscal year for the design and construction of public buildings.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING
WASHINGTON 25, D.C.

11 December 1956

Dear General Lane:

The members of the Commission of Fine Arts were glad to meet with Mr. Gerard Sawyer of your office, Mr. William H. Livingston of Harbeson, Hough, Livingston and Larson, and Mr. J.H.Herendeen of Gannett, Fleming Corddry and Carpenter, Incorporated, Consultants, at their meeting on 19 November 1956, to consider your presentation of the design drawings for the Southwest Freeway Interchange to be located as a feature of the Inner Loop in the vicinity of Third and F Streets, Southwest.

The treatment of the architectural features of the design was approved as presented in the drawings labelled COMM 699, SK 19 dated 14 November 1956; COMM 699, SK 20 dated October 31,1956; and in an unlabelled drawing dated 2 July 1956, revised 9 July 1956. It is hoped that plans will be carried out to assure development and accomplishment of the landscaping indicated on the drawings, and that careful study will be made to produce a system of lighting and lighting standards that will be suitable for use in an area of such close proximity to the Capitol and the Mall.

Approval of the architectural features of the design of this particular interchange should not be construed to mean, however, that the Commission of Fine Arts favors the general scheme for the Freeway as presented. We feel compelled to express again our strong conviction that any scheme which does not contemplate removal of the railroad tracks, or depression of the tracks, is not in the best interest for developing a long-range aspect for the southwest part of the city. At this interchange, the roadway will pass under the railroad and will block forever any future solution of this important problem which now blights the civic beauty of the National Capital in close proximity to the Capitol itself. We believe it is especially important that the question of the railroad tracks should be raised and decided before large expenses are incurred in constructing the proposed Freeway. To this end I am sending copies of this letter to the Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission and to the Architect of the Capitol.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

Brig. Gen. Thomas A. Lane
District of Columbia
Engineer Commissioner
520 District Building
Washington 4, D. C.

cc- Mr. J.N.Robertson
Hon. Harland Bartholomew
Mr. J. George Stewart

Exhibit I

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING
WASHINGTON 25, D.C.

11 December 1956

Dear General Lane:

The members of the Commission of Fine Arts were glad to meet with Mr. Gerard Sawyer of your office, Mr. William V. Livingston of Harbeson, Hough, Livingston and Larson, and Mr. J.M.Henrendez of Garrett, Flooring Corddry and Carpenter, Incorporated, Consultants, at their meeting on 19 November 1956, to consider your presentation of the design revisions for the Southwest Freeway Interchange to be located as a feature of the Inner Loop in the vicinity of Third and P Streets, Southwest.

The treatment of the architectural features of the design was approved as presented in the drawings labelled OCMM 6999, SK 20 dated October 31,1956; and in an unlabelled drawing dated 2 July 1956, revised 9 July 1956. It is hoped that plans will be carried out to secure development and accomplishment of the landscaping indicated on the drawings, and that careful study will be made to produce a system of lighting and lighting standards that will be suitable for use in an area of such close proximity to the Capitol and the Mall.

Approval of the architectural features of the design of this particular interchange should not be construed to mean, however, that the Commission of Fine Arts favors the general scheme for the Freeway as presented. We feel compelled to express again our strong conviction that any scheme which does not contemplate removal of the railroad tracks, or depression of the tracks, is not in the best interest of developing a long-range aspect for the southwest part of the city. As this interchange will pass over the railroad and will block forever any future solution of this important problem which now blights the civic beauty of the National Capital in those proximity to the Capitol itself. We believe it is especially important that the question of the railroad tracks should be solved and decided before large expenses are incurred in constructing the proposed Freeway. To this end I am sending copies of this letter to the Chairmen of the National Capital Planning Commission and to the Architect of the Capitol.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Brig. Gen. Thomas A. Lane
District of Columbia
Engineer Commissioner
320 District Building
Washington 4, D. C.

Duncan K. Finley
Chairman

cc- Mr. J.M.Robertson
Hon. Harland Bartholomew
Mr. J. George Stewart

Exhibit #1

APPENDIX 3

13. SHIPSTEAD-LUCE SUBMISSIONS (formal):

SL 1917 149 Independence Ave., SE - 1 blue canvas awning.

SL 1921 2200 P St., NW - 5'-6" cinder-block wall (screening fence).

SL 1923 5704 Oregon Ave., NW - 1½-story brick residence.

SL 1924 5708 Oregon Ave., NW - 1½-story brick residence.

SL 1925 1105 D St., SW - 2 temporary signs, flush against bldg., 24 sq-ft each.

SL 1926 107 D St., NW - 1 blue canvas awning above front entrance of restaurant.

SL 1927 627 Penna. Ave., NW - Repair vehicular damage to show window by replacing 2 plate glass, replace damaged marble on base & repair base; no changes.

SL 1928 8145 East Beach Dr., NW - 2-story brick dwelling.

SL 1929 8153 East Beach Dr., NW - 2-story brick dwelling.

PENDING:

SL 1825 230-22nd St., NW - 3-story office building for the National Association of Life Underwriters - Held for revised design.

SL 1912 715-4th St., NW - 2-story office & film exchange bldg. for Columbia Pictures Corp. - Held for revised design.

SL 1913 2017 Va. Ave., NW - 1 single-faced, 25 sq-ft, neon sign - Held for revised design.

EXHIBIT J

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
13 DECEMBER 1956

ORDER OF BUSINESS

9:30 a.m. 1. CONVENE, ROOM 7000 INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING.

2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS:

(a) Minutes of meeting 10 October 1956.
(b) Minutes of meeting 19 November 1956.

3. DATE OF NEXT MEETING - 24 January 1957 - 7 March 1957.

4. REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS SINCE 19 NOVEMBER MEETING. (SEE APPENDIX 1).
5. REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS SINCE 19 NOVEMBER MEETING. (SEE APPENDIX 2).

10:00 a.m. 6. DISCUSSION AND APPROPRIATE ACTION:

(a) Briefing by Secretary on order of business.

(b) Legislation - letter to Hon. Frank Thompson, Jr. re. proposed legislation to expand the Commission of Fine Arts.

(c) Commission of Fine Art's letter to D. C. Commissioner re. lack of support on disapprovals of applications submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts.

(d) Firehouse #32, at 24th & Irving St., SE - lack of support of D. C. Supervising Architect on specifications. (Phone call from Mr. Yerkes).

(e) Progress of Executive Order.

10:30 a.m. 7. BRIDGE/TUNNEL AT CONSTITUTION AVENUE OVER THE POTOMAC RIVER - Status (Briefing by Mr. H. T. Thompson, Associate Superintendent, National Capital Parks).

11:15 a.m. 8. SITE OF PERSHING MEMORIAL - Joint Meeting with National Capital Planning Commission.

11:45 a.m. 9. SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT SUBMISSIONS (Preliminary):

(a) Vanguard Computing Center (International Business Machines Corp.) - proposed remodelling of existing bldg. at 615 Pa. Ave., NW for use by IBM. (Mr. E. H. Corey, Coordinator of Personnel for IBM; Mr. Horace W. Peaslee, Architect).

1230

1:00 p.m. LUNCH IN SECRETARY'S DINING ROOM

2:00 p.m. 10. SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT SUBMISSIONS (Preliminary) (Continued):

(b) Proposed building for Associated General Contractors on the northeast corner of 20th and E Sts., NW; to be 3 stories with basement (Mr. E. V. Gauger of Chatelain, Gauger and Nolan, Architects).

2:30 p.m. 10A

3:00 p.m. 11. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, NATIONAL CAPITAL PARKS:

(a) Netherlands Carillon. (Presentation and explanation of drawings for the tower. Mr. Harry T. Thompson, Associate Superintendent, Mr. William Haussmann, Landscape Architect of National Capital Parks;*Baron van Voorst Tot Voorst, Minister, The Embassy of the Netherlands).

3:45 p.m. 12. SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT SUBMISSIONS (formal) (See Appendix 3).

ADJOURN

J. R. Bowersox, Jr. a.s.c.

David N. Yerkes, Architect
Deedert & Yerkes

*Mr. J. A. van Houten, Counselor for Press & Cultural Affairs, may represent Baron van Voorst Tot Voorst.